

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

ISELIN, NJ 08830	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
SIEMENS CORPORATION EXAMINER INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830 2146	10/568,116	02/13/2006	Gottfried Rieger	2003P13100WOUS	5505		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830 2145			8	EXAMINER			
ISELIN, NJ 08830 ART UNIT PAPER NUMS 2145	INTELLECTU	AL PROPERTY DEPA	ARTMENT	JAKOVAG	JAKOVAC, RYAN J		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE DELIVERY M.				2145			
MAIL DATE DELIVERY MO							
				MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/568,116	RIEGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RYAN J. JAKOVAC	2145	

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 25 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. Q The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailling date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailling date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,138(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1,138(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for under 37 CFR 1,17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for thin (b) above, if checked. Any reply reserved by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise he issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:

Claim(s) objected to:

Claim(s) rejected: 10.11.13 and 16-18.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-9,12,14,15.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other:

/Jason D Cardone/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Brandt does not teach two communication paths, however the Examiner respectfully disagrees. See at least col. 11, line 15 to col. 13, line 5 of Brandt. The arguments towards motivation are forciosed by KSR v. Teleflex, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. C. 1772, 82 U.S.P.O.20 1385 (2007).